

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, the specification and the abstract are amended. In addition, claims 1 and 3 are amended and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments of the specification and the abstract do not introduce new matters. Support for the amendments of claims 1 and 3 can be found at least in the paragraph beginning on page 11, line 26 of the specification.

In response to the Office Action dated October 3, 2003, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-10, with traverse.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 1 and 3 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 4-10 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 1-10 are not indefinite and the rejection should be respectfully withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 099458 to Takao et al. (hereinafter "Takao"). Amended claim 1 includes the limitation of "silane coupling agent content in the absorption layer". Takao does not disclose the limitation. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 depend from claim 1. Thus the rejection should be respectfully withdrawn at least because each of claim 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 includes at least one feature that Takao fails to disclose.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takao and further in view of JP 07-307133 to Oishi et al. (hereinafter "Oishi").

However, the Office Action states, “Regarding claim 2 the prior art of record neither shows nor suggests the absorption layer on a display unit having all the claimed limitations and particularly comprising the silane coupling agent content being from twice to seven times as high as the total weight of the solid content of organic material and SiO₂.” (page 8, lines 13-16 of the Office Action). The Office Action acknowledges that prior arts fail to disclose or suggest the silane coupling agent content being from twice to seven times as high as the total weight of the solid content of organic material and SiO₂.

Amended claim 1 includes the limitation of “silane coupling agent content in the absorption layer is from two to seven times as high as total content of SiO₂ and the organic coloring matter”. Claim 4 depends from amended claim 1 and thus includes the same limitation.

The Office Action fails to show that the combination of Takao and Oishi teaches or suggests the limitation of “silane coupling agent content in the absorption layer is from two to seven times as high as total content of SiO₂ and the organic coloring matter”. The rejection should be respectfully withdrawn at least because of this reason.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takao. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and thus includes the limitation of “silane coupling agent content”. Takao fails to teach or suggest “a silane coupling agent in the absorption layer”. Thus, the rejection should be respectfully withdrawn at least because of this reason.

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: 

Dale S. Lazar

Reg. No.: 28,872

Tel. No.: (703) 905-2126

Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

DSL/yo
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000